

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 10-35 are pending in this application. Claims 10, 18, 20, 21, 29 and 30 are amended. Claims 31-35 are added. No new matter has been added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated March 31, 2008, claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 10, 12, 16, 20 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gentile et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0205799. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gentile et al. in view of Chan et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0085163. Claims 14, 15, 17-19, 26 and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gentile et al. Claims 13, 21 and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 29 stands rejected due to the use of the trademark “Blue Tooth.” Applicant has amended the claim to delete the reference to “Blue Tooth”, and to replace it with “wireless protocol.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and 103(a)

All of the independent claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 103 based on Gentile et al. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the reasoning expressed in the Office Action, Applicant is amending all the independent claims to recite that the various elements (including the detector itself and the display) form an integral device in a common housing (see allowable claim 21). Claim 21, which previously recited a common housing, has been also amended accordingly.

This feature is not taught or suggested by Gentile. Gentile discloses a large detector, and a separate computer on which the results are displayed. This is illustrated in the figures of the Gentile patent, and in the materials previously provided by the Applicant to the Examiner. Additionally, given the form factor of Gentile, it makes no sense to try to add a display to the detector itself – the device is large enough and bulky enough that it is intended to be carried to a particular location and left there. Furthermore, Gentile discloses that several such detectors can be located at various points, and tied to a single computer, for use by a single operator (see, for example, paragraph 0044 in Gentile). As such, Gentile clearly teaches away from this feature.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for

any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARDMESSER LAW GROUP

/GB/

George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,020

Date: May 12, 2008

910 17th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191